

1 ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
2 MARK R. BECKINGTON
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 TODD GRABARSKY
Deputy Attorney General
4 ROBERT L. MEYERHOFF
Deputy Attorney General
5 State Bar No. 298196
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
6 Los Angeles, CA 90013-1230
Telephone: (213) 269-6177
7 Fax: (916) 731-2144
E-mail: Robert.Meyerhoff@doj.ca.gov
8 *Attorneys for Rob Bonta, in his Official Capacity as*
Attorney General of the State of California

9
10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12

13 **RENO MAY, AN INDIVIDUAL, ET AL.;**
14 **Plaintiffs,**
15 **v.**
16 **ROBERT BONTA, IN HIS OFFICIAL**
17 **CAPACITY AS ATTORNEY GENERAL OF**
18 **THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND DOES**
19 **1-10,**

Case No. 8:23-cv-01696-MRA (ADSx)

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT
STATEMENT**

Courtroom: 10B
Judge: Hon. Mónica Ramírez
Almadani
Action Filed: September 12, 2023

JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

Pursuant to the Court's Reassignment Order (Dkt. No. 56), the parties submit the following Joint Case Management Conference Statement:

a) The date the case was filed. September 12, 2023.

b) A list identifying or describing each party. Plaintiffs Reno May, Anthony Miranda, Eric Hands, Gary Brennan, Oscar A. Barretto, Jr., Isabelle R. Barretto, Barry Bahrami, Pete Stephenson, Andrew Harms, Jose Flores, and Dr. Sheldon Hough, DDS, are individuals who allege the challenged sensitive place provisions of Senate Bill 2 (SB 2), 2023 Cal. Stat. c. 249, violate their constitutional rights. Plaintiffs Second Amendment Foundation, Gun Owners of America, Gun Owners Foundation, Gun Owners of California, Inc., Liberal Gun Owners Association, and California Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc., are organizational plaintiffs who allege that the challenged sensitive place provisions of SB 2 violate their members' constitutional rights. Defendant Rob Bonta is the Attorney General of the State of California and the State's chief law enforcement officer.

c) A brief summary of all claims, counter-claims, cross-claims, or third-party claims. Plaintiffs assert three claims: (1) a Second Amendment claim; (2) a due process claim; and (3) a First Amendment claim. There are no counter-claims, cross-claims, or third-party claims as of yet in this case.

d) A brief description of the events underlying this action. Plaintiffs allege that the challenged sensitive place provisions of SB 2 violate the Second Amendment and the Due Process Clause. Plaintiffs allege that one of those challenged sensitive place provisions, California Penal Code Section 26230(a)(26), also violates the First Amendment under the compelled speech doctrine.

e) A description of the relief sought and the damages claimed with an explanation of how damages have been (or will be) computed. Plaintiffs seek declaratory relief, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, costs of suit

1 (including attorney's fees and costs), and all other relief the court deems appropriate.
2 Plaintiffs are not seeking damages at this time.

3 f) The status of discovery, including any significant discovery
4 management issues, as well as the applicable cut-off dates. Discovery has not
5 commenced in this case, nor has any discovery cut-off been set.

6 g) A procedural history of the case, including any previous motions that
7 were decided or submitted, any ADR proceedings or settlement conferences that have
8 been scheduled or concluded, and any appellate proceedings that are pending or
9 concluded. After filing the Complaint, Plaintiffs moved for a preliminary injunction,
10 Defendant opposed that motion, and, after a hearing on the motion on December 20,
11 2023, the court issued the preliminary injunction Plaintiffs requested. Dkt. No. 46.
12 Defendant appealed the issuance of the preliminary injunction and filed an
13 emergency motion to stay the injunction pending appeal, 9th Cir. Case No. 23-4356,
14 Dkt. Nos. 1, 4, which Plaintiffs opposed, 9th Cir. Dkt. No. 14. The motions panel
15 granted an administrative stay of the preliminary injunction on December 30, 2023,
16 9th Cir. Dkt. No. 17, and the merits panel dissolved that stay on January 6, 2024, 9th
17 Cir. Dkt. No. 20. The Ninth Circuit ordered expedited briefing on the appeal, oral
18 argument was held on April 11, 2024, and the appeal is now under submission. 9th
19 Cir. Dkt. No. 74.

20 On January 11, 2024, while the appeal of the preliminary injunction was
21 pending, the district court entered a joint stipulation from Plaintiffs and Defendant
22 extending the deadline to file a responsive pleading to the Complaint until 21 days
23 after the Ninth Circuit issues a decision on the appeal of the preliminary injunction.
24 Dkt. No. 54.

25 h) A description of any other deadlines in place before reassignment. There
26 were no deadlines in place prior to reassignment.

27 i) Whether the parties will consent to a magistrate judge for trial. The
28 parties do not consent to a magistrate judge for trial.

j) A statement from each parties' counsel indicating they have (1) discussed the magistrate judge consent program with their respective client(s), and (2) met and conferred to discuss the consent program and selection of a magistrate judge. Defendant's counsel has discussed the magistrate judge consent program with its client. Plaintiffs' counsel has discussed the magistrate judge consent program with its clients. Counsel for Plaintiffs and Defendant have met and conferred to discuss the consent program and selection of a magistrate judge.

Dated: June 21, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
MARK R. BECKINGTON
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

/s/ Robert L. Meyerhoff
ROBERT L. MEYERHOFF
Deputy Attorney General
*Attorneys for Defendant Rob Bonta in
his official capacity as Attorney
General of the State of California*

Dated: June 21, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

/s/ Kostadinos T. Moros
KOSTADINOS T. MOROS
JOSHUA R. DALE
Attorneys for Plaintiffs